1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
789	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
10 11	COLLINS SYLVESTER WILLIAMS JR, Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C14-5500 RBL-JRC
12	v.	ORDER TO FILE AN AMENDED COMPLAINT
13	WASHINGTON CORRECTIONS CENTER.	
14 15	Defendant.	
16	The District Court has referred this 42 U.S.C. & 1083 civil rights action to United States	
17	Magistrate Judge J. Richard Creatura. The authority for the referral is 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A)	
18	and (B), and local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR3 and MJR4.	
19	In his proposed complaint plaintiff names the Washington Corrections Center as	
20	defendant. Dkt. 1. This entity cannot be sued in a federal civil rights action for damages.	
21		
22		
23	Section 1983 claims against states, therefore, are legally frivolous. <i>See Jackson v. Arizona</i> , 885 F.2d 639, 641 (9th Cir. 1989). This rule applies equally to state agencies. <i>See Kaimowitz v.</i>	
24	F.20 039, 041 (901 C1r. 1989). This rule applies ed	quarry to state agencies. See Kaimowitz v.

Board of Trustees of the Univ. of Ill., 951 F.2d 765, 767 (7th Cir. 1991); Johnson v. Rodriguez, 943 F.2d 104, 108 (1st Cir. 1991). A governmental agency that is an arm of the state is not a "person" for purposes of § 1983 See Howlett v. Rose, 496 U.S. 356, 365 (1990); Flint v. Dennison, 488 F.3d 816, 824-25 (9th Cir. 2007). Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, the Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The Court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are legally "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(b)(1), (2) and 1915(e)(2); See Barren v. Harrington, 152 F.3d 1193 (9th Cir. 1998). A complaint is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227-28 (9th Cir. 1984). A complaint or portion thereof, will be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted if it appears the "[f]actual allegations . . . [fail to] raise a right to relief above the speculative level, on the assumption that all the allegations in the complaint are true." See Bell Atlantic, Corp. v. Twombly, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 1965 (2007) (citations omitted). In other words, failure to present enough facts to state a claim for relief that is plausible on the face of the complaint will subject that complaint to dismissal. Id. at 1974. To state a claim against a person, plaintiff must specifically identify as each person being sued. He must also allege facts showing that the person was acting under color of state law and that their conduct deprived plaintiff of rights, privileges or immunities secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States. Parratt v. Taylor, 451 U.S. 527, 535 (1981) (overruled

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in part on other grounds); Daniels v. Williams, 474 U.S. 327, 330-31, (1986). Plaintiff must allege facts that show that the conduct of defendant deprived plaintiff of a right. See Mt. Healthy City School Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. Doyle, 429 U.S. 274, 286-87, (1977); Flores v. Pierce, 617 F.2d 1386, 1390-91 (9th Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 875 (1980). When a plaintiff fails to allege or establish one of these elements, his complaint must be dismissed. That plaintiff may have suffered harm, even if due to another's negligent conduct does not in itself necessarily demonstrate an abridgment of constitutional protections. Davidson v. Cannon, 474 U.S. 344 (1986). Vague and conclusory allegations of official participation in civil rights violations are not sufficient to withstand a motion to dismiss. Pena v. Gardner, 976 F.2d 469, 471 (9th Cir. 1992). Causation and personal participation are closely related concepts. In order to state a claim against a defendant under 42 U.S.C. §1983, a plaintiff must allege facts showing that the particular defendant has caused or personally participated in causing the deprivation of a particular protected constitutional right. Arnold v. International Business Machines Corp., 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9th Cir. 1981); Sherman v. Yakahi, 549 F.2d 1287, 1290 (9th Cir. 1977). To be liable for "causing" the deprivation of a constitutional right, the particular defendant must commit an affirmative act, or omit to perform an act, that he or she is legally required to do, and the conduct must cause plaintiff's deprivation. Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978). The inquiry into causation must be individualized and focus on the duties and responsibilities of each individual defendant whose acts or omissions are alleged to have caused a constitutional deprivation. Leer v. Murphy, 844 F.2d 628, 633 (9th Cir. 1988); see also Rizzo v. Goode, 423 U.S. 362, 370-71, 375-77 (1976). Sweeping conclusory allegations against an

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

official are insufficient to state a claim for relief. Plaintiff must set forth specific facts showing a causal connection between each defendant's actions and the harm allegedly suffered by plaintiff. Aldabe v. Aldabe, 616 F.2d 1089, 1092 (9th Cir. 1980); Rizzo, 423 U.S. at 371. The Court orders plaintiff to file an amended complaint naming a proper defendant and setting forth facts that state a cause of action against the named defendants. The Amended Complaint will act as a complete substitute for the original and not as a supplement. The Amended Complaint must be filed on or before August 8, 2014. Plaintiff's failure to file an amended complaint or failure to cure the defects in the original complaint will result in a Report and Recommendation that this action be dismissed. **DATED** this 7th day of July, 2014. Richard Creatura United States Magistrate Judge